



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

V → S

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/935,629    09/23/97    BATES

E

GARY HOFFMAN  
285 HAWTHORNE ROAD  
PITTSBURGH PA 15209

IM62/0630

EXAMINER

ALEXANDER, L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1743

DATE MAILED: 06/30/99

9

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks**

# Advisory Action

Application No.

08/935,629

Applicant(s)

Bates et al.

Examiner

Lyle A. Alexander

Group Art Unit

1743



## THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☐ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on \_\_\_\_\_ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Jun 14, 1999 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

### ☒ The proposed amendment(s):

☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.

☒ will not be entered because:

- ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
- ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
- ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
- ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: The proposed amendment empty of solid material raises new 35 USC 112 second paragraph issues because it is not clear what is in the chamber. Presumably some type of fluid/flow controls means is present in the chamber.

- ☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

- ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
- ☐ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

- ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: none

Claims objected to: none

Claims rejected: 23-41

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

- ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

- ☒ Other The arguments were not convincing. Applicants state Senior does not inherently teach sealing the top of the opening. Senior teaches in column 2 lines 30+ sealing the sample addition portion to prevent fluid from escaping and has been properly read on the instant claims. Even if the limitations directed to "empty space" were clarified with respect to 35 USC 112 second paragraph, it is sufficiently broad to be

LYLE A. ALEXANDER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 1743